In re David SHARONY Appln. No. 10/523,204 Amendment dated July 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action dated April 6, 2010

REMARKS

After carefully reviewing the Final Action, the Applicant has decided to accept claims now held by the Examiner to be directed to allowable subject matter, whereby the present application is now placed in condition for allowance at the present time without further dispute. The amendments above rewrite allowable claim 3 in the form of currently amended claim 2, and rewite allowable claim 25 in the form of currently amended claim 24; all the other claims depend directly or indirectly from claims 2 and 24, and therefore incorporate the subject matter thereof, whereby all the claims in the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Based on the amendments presented above, the claims in the application are claims 2, 4-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31-33 and 36-40. As indicated above, and consistent with what is stated in the final action, the main claims now correspond to allowable claims 3 and 25, rewritten in independent form as claims 2 and 24, whereby all the claims should now be in condition for formal allowance. Such allowance is respectfully urged.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31-33 and 36-40 have been rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by Ellis, previously applied as a secondary reference. For the record, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nevertheless, Applicant need not address this rejection at the present time in view of the amendments made above. More particularly, claims 3 and 25 have not been so rejected, and claims 2 and 24 now correspond to allowable claims 3 and 25, and all the other claims depend ultimately from the two main allowable claims.

Also for the record, the amendments made above are made entirely without prejudice to Applicant's rights to pursue broader claims in a continuing application, if Applicant chooses to do so, Applicant in such a case relying on §§120 and 119.

Claims 3, 8, 21, 23, 25 and 38 have not been finally rejected. In paragraph 4 on page 7, as well as in the Office Action Summary, these claims are indicated as being directed to allowable subject matter. Applicant accordingly understands that these claims are deemed to

In re David SHARONY Appln. No. 10/523,204

Amendment dated July 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action dated April 6, 2010

define novel and unobvious subject matter under §§102 and 103 and to meet all other requirements for patentability, including those of §§101 and §112. Applicant is proceeding in reliance thereof.

Favorable consideration, entry of the amendments presented above, and early formal allowance are earnestly solicited.

If any problems remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Applicant

Ву

Sheridan Neimark Registration No. 20,520

SN:ltm

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\C\cohn\sharonyl\pto\2010-07-06AMD_AF.doc